



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,200	05/08/2001	Robert Beckwith	B1-4171	4197
24319	7590	11/17/2006	EXAMINER	
LSI LOGIC CORPORATION 1621 BARBER LANE MS: D-106 MILPITAS, CA 95035			MEUCCI, MICHAEL D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/852,200

Applicant(s)

BECKWITH ET AL.

Examiner

Michael D. Meucci

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS; WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7,8,10-17,20,22,23,27,30-33,36,38 and 41-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 30-33,36,38 and 42-46 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7,8,10-17,20,22,23,27 and 41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

In view of the appeal brief filed on 19 May 2006, **PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED**. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, Applicant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then Applicant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below.

Because new grounds of rejection are being made, this action is **non-final**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 41 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 41 provides for the use of a server process and a client process, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced. The server process and client process are non-functional because the claim language specifies that they are merely "capable" of sending and receiving messages, but nowhere states that this functionality is ever performed. Additionally, the control process, as disclosed, is "for" receiving and sending messages and contains no functional language. The only *functional* language in the claim is the setting of synchronization points by the control process. But, for the purpose of applying art, the remaining claim language has been evaluated as if it were functional based on the examiner's presumption that the server/client/control processes are intended to include functional claim language. Applicant is required to amend the claims to include functional claim language if the server/client/control process limitations disclosed are intended to be examined as functional processes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 41, 7, 11, 17, and 23, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuo et al. (U.S. 6,330,582 B1) hereinafter referred to as Kuo in view of Dearth et al. (U.S. 5,732,247) hereinafter referred to as Dearth.

a. As per claim 41, Kuo teaches: at least one server process capable of sending and receiving messages (abstract and lines 13-17 of column 3); at least one client process capable of sending and receiving messages (abstract and lines 13-17 of column 3); only one control process for passing the messages to and from the server process and the client process (abstract, lines 20-35 of column 2, and lines 49-52 of column 3); and where the server process, the client process, and the control process are all separate and distinct processes, and all messages between the server process and the client process are controlled by and relayed through the control process (lines 43-47 of column 3).

Kuo does not explicitly teach: the control process sets synchronization points in the server process, the synchronization points indicating points in time where the server process pauses until restarted by the control process. However, Dearth discloses: "In response to the occurrence of a selected event during the simulation run, a transactor 15 will suspend the simulation run and notify the simulator interface (step 118). In

response, the simulator interface 20 may generate a message packet of the signal packet type to notify the communications interface core 20 that the simulation run has been suspended (step 119). The synchronization control module 22 will verify that all of the tests 11(t) are in a paused condition (step 120), and if so will enable the tests 11(t) to resume processing (step 121), using a callback function for a test 11(t) if the test provided a callback function identifier for use in connection with message packets of the signal packet type," (lines 13-25 of column 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have the control process set synchronization points in the server process, the synchronization points indicating points in time where the server process pauses until restarted by the control process. "At that point, operations will return to step 108 and to enable the mailboxes 23 to be reloaded and/or the simulation run resumed," (lines 25-27 of column 17). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have the control process set synchronization points in the sever process, the synchronization points indicating points in time where the server process pauses until restarted by the control process in the system as taught by Kuo.

b. As per claim 7, Kuo teaches: said control process sets up a server order queue... (lines 33-35 of column 2 and lines 35-42 of column 3).

c. As per claim 11, Kuo teaches: said control process sets up a server order queue... (lines 33-35 of column 2 and lines 35-42 of column 3).

d. As per claim 17, Kuo teaches: said control process software module sets up a plurality of predetermined ordered queues... (lines 33-35 of column 2 and lines 35-42 of column 3).

e. As per claim 23, Kuo teaches: the control process stops the server process when the server process reaches a synchronization point (lines 53-58 of column 4)

5. Claims 8, 16, and 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuo and Dearth as applied to claim 41, in view of Baker et al. (U.S. 6,611,498 B1) hereinafter referred to as Baker.

a. As per claim 8, Kuo teaches: said server process evaluates an event expression to determine the occurrence of an event in the server process (lines 24-42 of column 3); and the server process sends an event expression message to the control process upon the occurrence of the event in the server process (lines 24-42 of column 3).

Kuo does not explicitly teach: said event expression message containing a time stamp... However, Baker discloses: "A client session's time stamp is updated each time a message transaction containing the session id for the session is received," (lines 13-15 of column 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have the event expression message contain a time stamp. "If the time stamp value shows that a session has aged, the session entry for the aged

session is cleared from the session table 660," (lines 23-35 of column 17 in Baker). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have the event expression message contain a time stamp in the system as taught by Kuo.

b. As per claim 16, Kuo teaches: a plurality of client processes... (abstract); a plurality of client processes, each of said server processes evaluates... (lines 24-42 of column 3).

Kuo does not explicitly teach: said event expression message containing a time stamp... However, Baker discloses: "A client session's time stamp is updated each time a message transaction containing the session id for the session is received," (lines 13-15 of column 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have the event expression message contain a time stamp. "If the time stamp value shows that a session has aged, the session entry for the aged session is cleared from the session table 660," (lines 23-35 of column 17 in Baker). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have the event expression message contain a time stamp in the system as taught by Kuo.

c. As per claim 27, Kuo teaches: a plurality of server processes (abstract and lines 13-17 of column 3); a plurality of client processes associated with the server processes (abstract and lines 13-17 of column 3); the server processes communicating via the control process with the client processes (abstract, lines 20-35 of column 2, and

lines 49-52 of column 3); each of the server processes evaluates an even expression to determine the occurrence of an event in the server process (lines 24-42 of column 3).

Kuo does not explicitly teach: the server processes sends an event expression message to the control process upon the occurrence of the even in the server process, the event expression message contains a time stamp indicating a time at which the even occurred in the server process. However, Baker discloses: "A client session's time stamp is updated each time a message transaction containing the session id for the session is received," (lines 13-15 of column 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have the event expression message contain a time stamp. "If the time stamp value shows that a session has aged, the session entry for the aged session is cleared from the session table 660," (lines 23-35 of column 17 in Baker). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have the event expression message contain a time stamp in the system as taught by Kuo.

6. Claim 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuo and Dearth as applied to claim 41, in view of Trinh et al. (U.S. 6,654,956 B1) hereinafter referred to as Trinh.

a. As per claim 10, Kuo does not explicitly teach: the time stamp is an indication of the elapsed time from a start of the control process, and where the elapsed time is proportional to a time elapsed in the control process between the

synchronization points. However, Trinh discloses: "An embodiment of the invention compares the presentation time at the receiver with the server elapsed time estimated from timestamp values on the served data. When the presentation time and the server elapsed time differ by an unacceptably large amount, an adjustment is made to the audio data stream to re-synchronize the presentation time with the elapsed time, which effectively also synchronizes the overall presentation rate with the overall server rate," (line 67 of column 2 through line 8 of column 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have the time stamp as an indication of the elapsed time from a start of the control process, and where the elapsed time is proportional to a time elapsed in the control process between the synchronization points. "It would be advantageous to synchronize presentation of video data at a receiver with the rate the data is served by a video server without the need for a voltage control oscillator. This is achieved through real-time adjustments to the audio stream and subsequent synchronization of the video stream with the adjusted audio stream," (lines 56-61 of column 2 in Trinh). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have the time stamp as an indication of the elapsed time from a start of the control process, and where the elapsed time is proportional to a time elapsed in the control process between the synchronization points in the system as taught by Kuo.

7. Claims 12-13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuo in view of Dearth as applied to claim 11, further in view of Willmann et al. (U.S. 5,521,923) hereinafter referred to as Willmann.

As per claims 12 and 13, Kuo teaches: said control process receives a plurality of said event expression messages... (lines 33-35 of column 2 and lines 35-42 of column 3).

Kuo does not explicitly teach: said control process ordering each of said event expression messages... and said control process delivers said sorted event expression messages... However, Willmann discloses: "Each of these data packets is provided with a time stamp TS, which gives information on the order of arrival of the data packets. The queues QU1 and QU2 are organized as FIFO queues (FIFO=first-in-first-out)," (lines 16-19 of column 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have said control process ordering each of said event expression messages... and said control process delivers said sorted event expression messages... FIFO queue usage with timestamps is very well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have the control process ordering each of said even expression messages within said server order queue according to the earliest time of said time stamp at which said even occurred in said sever process and to have said control process delivers said sorted event expression messages to said client processes associated with said server processes

Art Unit: 2142

according to said predetermined ordered queue of client processes in the system as taught by Kuo.

8. Claims 14-15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuo and Dearth as applied to claim 41, in view of Wegrzyn (U.S. 5,729,540).

a. As per claims 14-15, Kuo does not explicitly teach: each client process sends a finish message; control process holds said finish messages; and control process sends a finish message... However, Wegrzyn discloses: "messages are scheduled using a temporary data structure--namely the combined messages/scheduling data block 68. The combined messages/scheduling data block 68 temporarily holds messages until the end of each scheduler processing cycle," (line 66 of column 14 through line 3 of column 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have each client process sends a finish message; control process holds said finish messages; and control process sends a finish message... "The combined messages/scheduling data block 68 temporarily holds messages until the end of each scheduler processing cycle when the messages are ready to be formatted by frame formatter 70," (lines 1-5 of column 15 in Wegrzyn). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have each client process sends a finish message; control process holds said finish messages; and control process sends a finish message in the system as taught by Kuo.

9. Claim 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuo and Dearth as applied to claim 41, in view of Schwaller et al. (U.S. 6,408,335 B1) hereinafter referred to as Schwaller.

a. As per claim 20, Kuo does not explicitly teach: the simulation environment simulates a device selected from a group consisting of electrical devices... However, Schwaller discloses: "Simulation tools provide a mathematical model of a network. The model is generated based on information about network design, hardware, and traffic patterns," (lines 43-45 of column 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to simulate a device selected from a group consisting of electrical devices... "Once the model is created, it can be used to predict network performance under different scenarios," (lines 45-47 of column 2 in Schwaller). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to simulate a device selected from a group consisting of electrical devices... in the system as taught by Kuo.

10. Claim 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuo and Dearth as applied to claim 41, in view of Gee (U.S. 6,178,395 B1).

a. Kuo does not explicitly teach: control process software module comprises a synchronization varying software module for varying the elapsed time duration between said synchronization points. However, Gee discloses: "Either the start time of the response or the duration of the response may then iteratively be modified to cause

Art Unit: 2142

the response to eventually overlap the hit window, thereby generating a correct response cue," (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have the control process software module comprise a synchronization varying software module for varying the elapsed time duration between said synchronization points. "Before calibration process 300 begins, the diagnostic/training software (such as OMDFF) may be initialized along with the data acquisition processor 106 of FIG. 2 to synchronize the progression of presenting the stimulus by the software and the mouse down signal durations generated by data acquisition computer/processor 104," (lines 55-61 of column 7 in Gee). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have the control process software module comprise a synchronization varying software module for varying the elapsed time duration between said synchronization points in the system as taught by Kuo.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7-8, 10-17, 20, 22-23, 27, and 41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Redmond (U.S. 6,370,139 B2) discloses providing information in a distributed networking environment.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Meucci at (571) 272-3892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell, can be reached at (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for this Group is 571-273-8300.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [michael.meucci@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

Art Unit: 2142

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Beatriz Prieto
BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Andrew Caldwell

ANDREW CALDWELL
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER